

Whether it ought to be by putting the whole body under water, or only Sprinkling a little water thereon.

I. *From the natural signification of the word.*

The Baptists or Dippers say,

* *Lisput. p. 25. (a) Pan. Cath. Tit. 4. l. 5. c. 2. (b) Diat. on Tit. 3. 2. (c) on Mat. 3. (d) of Prim. pap. p. 193. (e) of Jure nat. l. 2. c. 2. (f) Ode 2. (g) Rule Conf. l. 4. c. 4. (h) Annot. New Test. Mat. 3. Mark 7. &c. (i) Tract. Sac. p. c. 8. p. 177. (k) Dict.*

The Rantists or Sprinklers answer.

That it may be by sprinkling or pouring, by applying the Element to the person, not the person to the Element, appears by the nature of the word, which signifies to Wash as well as to Dip, as most Criticks acknowledge, Item Lavoisier Beudeus, Scapula, Stephens, Scriverius, Pasor, yea, to sprinkle, as Schindius, Dr. Featly.

The Baptist Reply.

That a word may have divers *Significations*, nay sometimes *contrary* one to the other, is no ways doubtful; for the Hebrew *Kodesh*, the proper word for *Holiness*, sometimes may signifie *Whoredom*, or *Sodomy*, Deut. 23. 17. *Hofea* 4. 14. 2 *Kings* 23. 17. And *Barack*, the word for *Blessing*, is taken sometimes for *Cursing*, Job 1. 5, 11. & 2. 9. Therefore the *genuine* and *proper Signification* is *mainly* to be eyed; and when respecting *Divine* things, the usage of Scripture, nature of the *thing*, and *scope* of the place, is to rule about it. It is true, the word may sometimes import washing; but as (a) *Beza* observes, only by consequence, not properly, because you cannot dip a thing, but you must wet or wash it: But never is taken for sprinkling. (a) *Beza* on *Mark* 7. 4. which in the *Treat. of Bap.* is mistakenly said to be *Erasmus*.

II. From the Scripture-Acceptation of the word.

The Baptists say,

Secondly, That it is by *Dipping*, may yet further be confirmed from the *Scripture-Acceptation* of the word, both in the Old and New-Testament: First, in the (a) *Old-Testament* the word *Tabal* one and the same with *Baptise*, as the Septuagint renders it (and as *Bezæ, Hammond, Minchius, Kircherus, &c.* and others do assert) is always & in every place, by all our English Translators, rendered to *Dip*. And in the (b) *New-Testament*, several times also to *Dip*, but most frequently by the Greek word it self *Baptise* or *Dip*, not *Ransie*, or *Sprinkle*; *Loise*, or *wash*; *Keise*, or *pour*: And therefore saith (c) *Mr. Rogers*, *The word imports nothing else but to Dip, for the Greek wanted not other words to express any other act besides Dipping, if the Institution could bear it, (as he saith) is exceeding material to the Ordinance, as Scripture and Antiquity informeth, and without exception to Countreys hot or cold.*

(a) Exod. 12.22. Lev. 4.6, 17. & 9.9. & 13.16. & 14.18. Josh. 3.15. Ruth. 2. 14. & 1 Kings 4.6, 10, 11. & 2 Kings 8.15. Job 9.31. 2 Kings 23.19. Ezek. 23.19. & 24.27. & 2 Kings 8.15. Job 9.31. 2 Kings 23.19. Mark 4.1. Deut. 33.29. (b) Luke 16.24. John 13.26. Mat. 5.14 & 26.23. 10. Rev. 19.13. (c) Treat. of Sacraments, part 1. ch.8.p.177.

The Rantists answer, may be by pouring or sprinkling, we have Confirmation from the Scripture Acceptation of the word. 1. Because the word Tabal is by Gen. 30. 37, 38. used by Moluno poluo, which by the circumstances must be sprinkling. And the Chald. Fitzsabab, Dan. 4. 20. which by the LXX. is rendred Ebephe, is translated wet, which must be by aspersion. And Rev. 19. 13. the word Bapto, compared Isa. 63. 3. must be sprinkled; and Mark 7. 48. to wash, not dip.

The Baptists Reply.

1. To figure out the *Covenant* on mans part that he visibly declares to enter into thereby; viz. To dye to sin, and to live to Christ in newness of life By that *figurative Death, Burial and Resurrection*, being put under the *water*, and taken out thereof, and therefore said to be *buried with Christ in Baptism*, as *Rom. 6.4. Col. 2. 11, 12, 13.* as so fully own'd by *Piscator, Tilenus, Disdat, Assemblies and Leigh's Annotations, Dr. Cave, Tilleson, Goodwin, Kerkman, Baxter, Magdaburg*, as *Treat. Bapt. B. 2. chap. 4.* doth particularize.

2. To be a sign of the Covenant on Gods part; viz. of *washing away of sins, cleansing* the whole man, and every part, and to give spiritual *Life and Salvation*, *Acts* 2. 32. & 22. 16. *1 Pet.* 3. 21. And to the end that whole and every part is be *washed*, that as every part is *defiled*, and needs *cleansing and purifying*, so must not one part be left *unbaptized*: Therefore *Ainsworth* treating upon Baptizing the Lepers under the Law (the Type hereof) saith, *Lev.* 15. 5. *That every part must be baptized, and if so much as the tip of the finger was left unbaptized, it was esteemed no Baptism*: And therefore saith the Learned (a) *Selden*, That the Jews (from whom this Rite is conceived to come) took that Baptism, wherein the whole body was not baptized, to be void. And to this end, (b) saith *Dr. Hamond*, they had large *Diving-places*, or *Baptisterions*, containing divers Baths of water, which they called *Columbethro's*, or *Diving-places*.

3. To figure out *Regeneration*, being as so generally own'd a *Symbol* of *Regeneration* wrought; therefore being born of spiritual water by *Regeneration*, *John 3. 5*. We are in the figure *taken out* of literal water, or born out of the *Bowels* of it. as we are really taken out of the *Womb* in the first birth.

4. To figure out our *Sanctification*, or newness of life; for as in Baptism we are all covered over, as with a garment, so we are said thereby to *put on* Christ, *Gal. 3. 27. viz.* his white Garment of *Righteousness* and *Holiness*, and therefore to expect from him to that end, according to *promise*, the being dipt or baptized into or with the Spirit, *Acts 11. 16. & 2. 38.*

(a) de Jure Nat. 1, 2, c. 2. (b) Upon John 13. 10.

The Rantists a

1. From the Analogy it hath with sprinkling Christ's blood upon the Conscience, Heb. 12. 24.

2. *Effusion of the Spirit*, A&S 2. 17.

3. *Washing of Regeneration*, Tit. 3, 5.

4. Pouring water upon the Ark, 1 Pet. 3. 23. the figure of Baptism.

The Baptists Reply.

It is true, 1. Christ's blood is said to be *sprinkled*, but that is in allusion to the sprinkling of the blood under the Law, *Heb. 9. 12, 13. & 19. 21.* with *Lev. 14. 6, 7, 8. Numb. 19. 17, 18, 19.* but not to express and point out to us the external Rite of Baptism, to which it bears no proportion either in name or nature. 2. That the Spirit is said to be *poured out* is very true; which respects that great *measure and quantity* of the Spirit, not the outward mode and Rite of Baptism; though that pouring out of the Spirit, as before is Metaphorically called the Baptism of the Spirit, in allusion to that of water, wherein was quantities of water, and whereof every member of the baptized person did partake: But families do not run of all four. 3. As to the *pouring water* upon the Ark, no question when the windows of Heaven were opened in that Deluge, great measures were *poured down* upon it; but that is not the *Figure of Baptism*: The figure wherein the *Ark and Baptism* are said in that place to hold *Analogy*, is in this, that as those persons that entered into the Ark in *Noah's* time, were saved in that Deluge, so they that enter into Christ the spiritual Ark by Faith; 3. and the *Visible* Ark, the Church, by Baptism, the visible door thereof do enter into the promised salvation: Therefore for any to use *Sprinkling* instead of *Dipping*, saith Dr. Taylor in his *Rul. Con. c. 4. p. 644.* is *not only against Ecclesiastical Law, but against the Analogy and mystical signification of the Sacrament*; and therefore he saith, is *not to be complied with.* As to that of the washing of Regeneration, I refer to that which is said in the Treatise of Baptism, *part 2. chap. 4.*

V. *From Scripture-Practice, and Command.*

The Baptists say,

Fifthly, *Dipping*, not *Sprinkling*, is the Rite of this great Ordinance, if we respect the *Scripture-Practice* or *Command* confirming the same: 1. The Practice, *Mat. 3. 15*. When *Jesus* was baptized, or dipt, he came straight way out of the water: Therefore *Cajetan* upon the place saith, that *Christ's* ascending out of the water, proves that he was baptized by *John*, not by sprinkling, but by Immersion, or dipping. And *Musculus* saith upon it, that the baptized *parries* were dipt, not sprinkled: And *John 3. 13*. *John* baptized at *Enon*, because there was much water. Upon which place saith *Calvin*, you may gather, that *John* and *Christ* administered Baptism, by plunging the whole body into the water. And *Acts 8. 38*. *Philip* and the Eunuch went both down into the water: And therefore saith *Calvin* upon it, We see what fashion the *Ancients* had to administer Baptism, for they plunged the whole body into water, &c. And the command to this was expreis, *Mat. 28. 19*. Go teach all Nations, dipping, (not sprinkling) them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. And *Acts 10. 48*. 'tis said, Peter com

were to be quite naked, for which he gives divers instances and Authorities for divers Ages. Dr. Cave in his *Prim. Christ. faith*, That of old the baptized party was immersed, or wholly put under water, which was the almost constant and universal custom of those times. (c) *Vossius* in p. 40. gives not only the nature of the word, from the old Glosses, and the Septuagint, and the best Criticsks, to be dipping; but from the sayings and usage of the Ancients from the true Immersion, till Gregory, and then the single Immersion by the Council of Tolitan; and how in these cold Climates it came to be altered. (d) Sir Norton Knatch in p. 40. gives the usage of it from the Scripture and Antiquity to be dipping, and that it so continues in the Greek Churches to this day. (e) And as *Daille* tells us, is still the practice of the Grecian and Russian Churches at this day, *Cassander de Bap.* p. 193. and that it was the confessed custom of the Church of England, their English Liturgy will determine, which required the party to be baptized, to be dip't in water, except in great extremity and weakness.

(a) De Reb. Eccles. (b) Ad Theol. wit. Resp. II. c. 8. (c) Vossius de
Bap. 14, to 64. (d) Animad. p. 297, to 319. (e) Ut sup.

Secondly, As to the change and alteration of this Rite, we have the following Confessions ; viz. (a) Mr. *Baxter* in his third Argument to Mr. *Blake* saith, as to the manner of it, it is commonly confest by us to the Anabaptists (as our Commentators declare) that in the Apostles time, the baptized were dipt over head in water ; and though since it hath been thought meet to disuse the manner of dipping, and to use less water. (b) *Chamier* confesseth, That the ancient use of Baptism was to dip the whole body into the Element, which is the force of the word Τὸ βάπτισμα, therefore did *John* baptize in a River, which is nevertheless changed into Asperision, though uncertain when and whence that custom was taken. The Marquis of *Worcester* in his *Certam. Relig.* confesseth, that the Church of *Rome* hath changed dipping the party over head and ears, into sprinkling upon the face, *Calvin* upon *Acts* 8. 38. confesseth, they have varied from the Apostolical practice, which was by plunging the body into the water. *Beza* upon *Gal.* 3. acknowledgeth, that it was the custom of old to baptize the Adult by immersing. (c) *Daille* further saith, as before, Though this custom of dipping be ancient and universal, yet it is now abolished by the Church of *Rome* ; and this is the reason, saith he, that the Muscovites say, that the Latines are not rightly and duly baptized, because they despised this ancient Ceremony of Dipping.

(a) 2 Disput. of the Rise to Sacraments. (b) Pau. Cathol. *Tom. 4. l. 5.*
c. 2. *Ser. 6.* (c) *Ut supra.*

The Rantists answer,

That sprinkling was very ancient in the Church, as well as dipping, appears out of Eusebius, witnessing, that Novatus was baptized by pouring water upon him. Walafrid Strabo is peremptory, that it was done both ways: And Cyp. Ep. to Mag. evidenceth it to have been of very ancient practice. Clem. Alex. p. 387. testifies the same; and though 'tis confessed, they did in some places of old dip the baptized, yet it was in hot Countries.

The Baptists Reply.

That sprinkling of the sick, or Clinical Baptism, did early creep in is confess: But (a) Dr. Taylor tells us from *Cornelius Ep. to Fabianus, Euseb. lib. 6. c. 43.* and out of *Magnus Ep. That they scrupled to receive into holy Orders, any that had only received the Clinical Baptism; yea, so much as to esteem them Christians, that had only been sprinkled.* And as *Vossius* in his *Book of Baptism* tells us, *is was questioned, whether they did not lye when they said, they baptized a person, when they only sprinkled him.* And as to baptizing in cold Countries by dipping, as well as hot, we have *Authentick* proof; there being, as *Dan. Rogers* saith, no distinction of hot or cold. *Russia*, as is well known, an extraordinary cold Country, whereas you have heard they have, and do still use the Rite of dipping to this day. And in *England* of old, how frequent was it to baptize in Rivers, witness *Germanus and Lupus, baptizing multitudes in the River Allin in Cheshire, Treast. of Bapt. p. 228. Paulinus great numbers in the River Spal in Yorkshires, and Trent in Nottinghamshire, Bed. Book 2. ch 16.* besides the appointment in the English Liturgy to dip little Children in this Country, and which hath been the practice in some places formerly, but especially the known, constant practice of the Baptists in *Holland, Germany, and England, both Winter and Summer, without the least detriment or inconveniency.*

(a) Rule Conf. *not supra.*

A brief Corrollary, containing some necessary Quæries upon the whole.

Quar. 1. **W**Hether is it not demonstrably evident by this Six-fold Argument (confirmed by so great Testimony both Divine and Humane) that *Dipping*, not *Sprinkling*, was the instituted Rite of this great Ordinance of *Baptism*?

Quar. 2. Whether this of *Dipping*, having been Christs positive *Appointment*, from all those holy ends, and spiritual *Reasons* enforcing it as well as his own and all the primitive *Saints* expresse practise, it will not appear to be very dangerous, and favour of too much *Presumption* and *Arrogancy*, upon such gross

said by Moluno poluo, which by the circumstances must be proved. The Chald. *Fitzsabab*, Dan. 4.20. which by the LXX. is rendred *Ebephe*, is translated wet, which must be by aspersion. And Rev. 19.13. the word *Bapto*, compared Isa. 63.3. must be sprinkled; and Mark 7.48. to wash, not dip.

The Baptists Reply.

That if it should be taken for granted, that the word in these four places may be taken otherwise than in all other places, will it be judged reasonable, that those four should out-balance and over-rule all the rest, which are above a hundred times rendred to dip. But in the next place, if the particulars be considered, you will not find them make good the thing pretended: For 1. As to Joseph's Coat, Gen. 37.31. if dipt in blood, as we render it, it may well be said to be polluted, dyed, or smeared therewith. And as to Dan. 4.20. the word *Fitzsabab* is by Montanus rendred *intingat* vel *aspergetur*: And if the Scripture do render it *Ebaphe*, which we translate wet, yet it must be granted to be such a wetting as is by dipping; viz. A thorough wetting, a wetting all over: A wetting by the dew of Heaven from above by aspersion, and a wetting by the dew of Heaven resting upon the long grass, by applying the body thereto, and so a dipping also; yea every part of the body. And as for Rev. 19.13. it is parallel with Isa. 63.12. as saith our English great Annotations, dyed, red Garments, and garments dipt in blood; being one and the same, though as in Vers. 3. Blood may be sprinkled upon Red Garments also. As for Mark 7.3. the word rendred wash is *Nipto*, not *Bapto*, which signifies when respecting washing of hands, a dipping up to the Elbows, as Dr. Hammond (and Theophilact, as in the margin) upon the place observe: And to which purpose, they had Water-pots containing two or three Firkins apiece always ready in their houses, as John 2.6. so that we should always (as the Dutch do) read it dip; and therefore in Vers. 8. it is explained to be such a washing, by the word dip or baptize.

III. From the Scripture-Metaphors explaining it.

The Baptists say,

Thirdly, That it is by Dipping, and wherein much water is required, and not by Sprinkling, wherein a small quantity of water sufficeth, appears from the Scripture-Metaphors alluding to this Rite; viz. When persons are said to be over-whelmed in great sufferings, they are said to be baptized therein, Matth. 20.22,23. Luke 12.5. When said to have great measures of the Spirit, it is to be Baptized with the Spirit, Acts 5.11,16. When the children of Israel were covered with a Cloud behind them, and over their heads, and the Sea on both sides, were then said to be Baptized in the Sea and Cloud, 1 Cor. 10.2. With Exod. 14.22. When Asa had the promised Blessing of great plenty, he is said to have his feet dipt in oyl. And when great victory over enemies, 'tis said, that feet are dipt in their Blood, Psal. 68.13.

IV. From the nature and ends of the Ordinance.

The Baptists say,

Fourthly, It is to be by Dipping, not Sprinkling, from the nature and ends of the Ordinance; viz. To a figure or sign in the outward Visible act of spiritual things held forth thereby, that by the sign, the thing signified might be exemplified; viz.

plunging the whole body into the water: And therefore saith Calvin upon it, Eunuch went both down into the water: We see what fashion the Ancients had to administer Baptism, for they plunged the whole body into water, &c. And the command to this was express, Mat. 28.19. Go teach all Nations, dipping, (not sprinkling) them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. And Acts 10.48. 'tis said, Peter commanded them to be dipt, (not sprinkled) in the name of the Lord, &c. And therefore whether this is not as plain a Command for a Believer to be dipt, and which he should no more shift or alter, than when we are commanded, Fagate, to eat of the Bread, &c. that we are literally and plainly to do so, without any changing or altering the same, as some have done in that and the like case also.

The Rantists answer,

That Sprinkling, not Dipping, was the usage in the Scripture; because how could they baptize by dipping three thousand in one day, Acts 2. And how could the Jailor be so baptized in his own house, Acts 16.

The Baptists Reply.

That the three thousand mentioned in Acts 2. were dipt, not sprinkled, is clear, not only from the words, because 'tis said in plain terms they were dipt, Acts 2.41. And they wanted not help in that great Administration, the Twelve and Seventy were witnesses, besides others of the 120 Disciples, that if need required, were capable to be helpful in the work. And as to the Jailor's being baptized in his own house (as suggested) 'tis a mistake; for after he was baptized, 'tis said, Vers. 34. he brought them into his house.

VI. From the practice of the Ancients, and confessed change from Dipping to Sprinkling.

The Baptists say,

Sixthly, As a further Confirmation by way of Illustration, that dipping was the Rite of this Ordinance, not sprinkling, may further appear from the Confessed practice of the Ancients for the first Ages, and the acknowledged change and alteration of it afterwards; In testimony whereof, Daille on the Fathers, lib. 2. p. 148. saith, That it was the custom heretofore in the Ancient Church to plunge, those they baptized, over head and ears into the water; as (saith he) Tertullian in Book 3. Cor. Mil. Cyp. in Ep. 7. p. 211. Epiph. Pa. 30. p. 128. and others testify. (a) Walsfrid Strabo saith, That at first Believers were baptized simply in Floods and Rivers. (b) Jeremias Pat. of Constant. saith, That the Ancients baptized not by sprinkling, but immersing, following the example of the Evangelist, who came up out of the water, therefore did he descend. Zopperus de Sacram. saith, from the Etymology of the word it doth appear, what was the custom of old of administering Baptism, which is since changed into Rantizing. Chrysostome, as Dr. Taylor in his Rule of Conscience, Book 4. c.4. tells us, That the old man is buried and drowned in the Immersion under water, and when the baptized person is afterwards raised up from the water, it represents the Resurrection of the new-man to newness of life. Mr. Jos. Mead upon Tit. 3. tells us, there was no such thing as Rantism or sprinkling in the Apostles time, nor many Ages after. And Dr. Taylor as above, saith, That the ancient Church did not in their Baptism sprinkle water with their hands, but did immerse; and therefore saith, we find in the Records of the Church, that the persons baptized

mane) that Dipping, not Sprinkling, was the instituted Rite of this great Ordinance of Baptism?

Quar. 2. Whether this of Dipping, having been Christs positive Appointment, from all those holy ends, and spiritual Reasons enforcing it as well as his own and all the primitive Saints express practise, it will not appear to be very dangerous, and favour of too much Presumption and Arrogancy, upon such gross mistakes, and upon nothing but Human Institution, to alter and change the same to a clear other Rite, inverting thereby so solemn a piece of Gods holy Worship, and introducing instead thereof, so groundless a Tradition and Invention of man; and doth not justly fall under the Reproofs and Threatnings of the following Scriptures, Matth. 15.9. In vain they do worship me, teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of men: Mark 7.7. For laying aside the Commandment of God, ye hold the Traditions of men, rejecting and frustrating the Commandments of God, to keep your own Traditions: Isa. 24.5. They have transgressed the Law, changed the Ordinances therefore, &c. And no less then a Violation of the First and Second Commandment, intrenching upon Gods Prerogative-Royal, wherein he is so jealous, the Presumption whereof cost Israel so dear?

Quar. 3. Whether sprinkling only a few drops of water upon the face, instead of dipping the whole person, doth not as much spoil the Symbol, and vacate the instituted significant ends of the Ordinance, as to eat only the Wafer, and reject the Cup, spoils the Ordinance of breaking of Bread, and drinking of Wine, in remembrance of the broken Body and Blood of our Lord: Or as some of old, when God commanded the foreskin to be circumcised, should have satisfied themselves to circumcise their nails, if they did but keep the name and ends of the Ordinance? And whether one is not as provoking to the Lord as the other?

Quar. 4. Whether to conform hereto, is not to yield obedience to the Institution and Injunction of Antichrist (for though 'tis granted it was in use before it was imposed by the Popes) as Infant-Baptism was, yet was it by them especially enjoined, as the other was, as confessed by so many of their own? And whether in so doing, there is not as great indignity offered to the Authority of Christ, and contempt to his Wisdom, as there is a declared subjection to, and owning and honouring such a gross Usurpation?

Quar. 5. Whether it may not rationally be supposed, that one great end of the Popes enjoying thereof, was not with more Pomp and Solemnity to establish and confirm Infant-Baptism, so much the Pillar and Foundation of his Church? And whether it doth not appear, he did upon as good ground change the Rite, as so alter the subject? And that he doth as warrantably, and by as good Scripture-Authority, sprinkle Bells, and Church-Walls and Standards, and call it Baptism, as the other?

Quar. 6. Whether for any to sprinkle an Infant, and to say they Baptize in the Name of the Father, Son, and Spirit, is not as much to tell a lye in the Name of the Lord, and to prophane a holy Ordinance of his, as they do who use the same Form in Baptizing of Bells? &c.

Quar. Whether Learned and good men may not, from the consideration of their mistake in the Rite, have cause to conclude they have mistaken the subject also? And that being neither right in the matter or manner of the Ordinance, it is a mere nullity, and therefore should engage them to the right performance in both, as they would approve themselves Christs Disciples and Followers, and not err in so great a foundation of the Christian Religion?